

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 3-7, 9 and 10 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Georgiou et al. (U.S. Patent 6,047,248). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Georgiou et al. teaches a method of automatically adjusting the processing unit work frequency including starting at least one set of sensors 119, setting trigger conditions for a frequency adjustment 230, monitoring the sensor in real time and detecting its status values 220, comparing the triggering conditions for the sensor status values in real time 240, and adjusting the CPU unit work function according to the comparison result in real time (Col. 7, lines 40-49). In regard to claim 2, the Examiner points out that sensor 119 is a temperature sensor.

By way of the present Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include one of the specific sensors described in claim 2. As the Examiner points out, the reference shows a temperature sensor. Applicant has modified claim 1 to state that the sensor is a voltage sensor. New claims 9 and 10 have been added which are similar to claim 1 but include a reference to an electric current sensor and a load sensor, respectively.

Applicant submits that claims 1, 9 and 10 define over Georgiou et al. since the sensor utilized is a temperature sensor in the reference, but other sensors in each of these three independent claims. Thus, Georgiou et al. does not show this method utilizing a voltage sensor,

an electric current sensor or a load sensor. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1, 9 and 10 are not anticipated by Georgiou et al.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to change the type of sensor since the Georgiou et al. reference is specifically designed to react to temperatures and not the other types of sensors. Further, there is no indication that it would be a simple manner for connecting the sensors to the various points in the system to determine the voltage current or loads. Accordingly, Applicant submits that such a change would not be obvious.

Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features which make them additionally allowable such as the manner in which the trigger and conditions are determined and that the frequency adjustment includes increasing or decreasing the frequency. Accordingly, these claims are considered to be additionally allowable.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Georgiou et al. in view of Kling et al. (U.S. Patent 6,367,023). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Georgiou et al. does not teach that the triggering conditions are set by the user when power on and stored in the computer. The Examiner relies on Kling et al. to show a system where the threshold is modifiable by the user on power on. Applicant submits that even if this reference does teach this feature, that claim 5 remains allowable based on its dependency from allowable claim 1. Further, Applicant submits that the limitations of claim 1 are not found in either Georgiou et al. or Kling et al. or their combination. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 5 remains allowable.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Georgiou et al. The Examiner again points out that element 119 is a thermosensor in the reference. By way of the present Amendment, Applicant has added the limitations of claim 8 to claim 7, except for the recitation of the temperature sensor. Thus, claim 7 now states that the sensor is either a voltage sensor, a current sensor or a load sensor. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable for the same reasons recited above in regard to claim 1. In particular, claim 7 is allowable since the Georgiou et al. reference does not show one of a voltage, current or load sensor. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 7 is also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,295 at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant